UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/787,698	03/21/2001	Ralf Neuneier	P01-0020	6143

21171 7590 07/01/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
HOLMES, MICHAEL B	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2121	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/787,698	NEUNEIER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael B. Holmes	2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *April 15, 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-21* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *22-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☒ Other: *Detailed Office Action*.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 - WWW.USPTO.GOV

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is responsive to communication received on April 15, 2005. Amendment under 37 CFR § 1.111. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application 09/787,698, is respectfully requested by applicant. All such supporting documentation has been placed in applicant's file.

2. Applicant's remarks have been fully considered, however, they are not persuasive.

3. Claims 22 & 36 stand rejected under Title 35 USC § 102(b) & claims 23-31, 33-38, and 40-42, stand rejected under Title 35 USC § 103(a), the complete text has been included below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

5. Claim 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Ralph Neuneier*, "Enhanced Q-Learning for Optimal Asset Allocation" Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (1997).

Regarding Claim 22. *Neuneier* teaches, A method for computer-aided determination of a sequence of actions for a system having states, the method comprising the steps of: performing a transition in state between two states on the basis of an action **[(2.1 Q-Learning for asset alloca- tion, page 937-938)]**; determining the sequence of actions to be performed such that a sequence of states results from the sequence of actions **[(2.1 Q-Learning for asset allocation, page 937-938)]**; optimizing the sequence of steps with re- gard to a prescribed optimization function, including a variable parameter **[(2.1 Q-Learning for asset allocation, page 937-938)]**; and using the variable para- meter to set a risk which the resulting sequence of states has with respect to a prescribed state of the system. **[(3.1 Risk-adjusted MDP's, page 941)]**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 23-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ralph Neuneier*, "Enhanced Q-Learning for Optimal Asset Allocation" Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (1997) further in view of *Werbos* (USPN 6,169,981).

The *Neuneier* reference has been discussed above and does not explicitly teach the limitation of claims 23-24, 26, 29-30. However, *Werbos* teach the limitations of claims 23-24, 26, 29-30.

Regarding Claim 23. *Werbos* teaches, using approximate dynamic programming for the purpose of determination. **[(col. 7, line 37-38 "***In Approximate Dynamic Programming (ADP) ... model to approximate this function J.***")]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ approximate dynamic programming (ADP), because, ADP allows for general-purpose programming for doing optimization over time by using learning and approximation. Moreover, ADP has emerging as one of the most promising mathematical and computational approaches to resolve the problem of nonlinear, large scale dynamic control problems under uncertainty.

Regarding Claim 24. *Werbos* teaches, basing the approximate dynamic programming Q-learning. **[(col. 93, line 38-50 "***The basic equation for* "J" *given in* ...P. Werbos, ... *Still, these designs are all a step up from the* 1983 **BSA** *design.***")]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ approximate dynamic programming (ADP) Q-Learning, because, Q-Learning is a stochastic approximation-like method that iterates on the Q-factors.

Regarding Claim 25. *Neuneier* teaches, forming an optimization function within Q-learning in accordance with the following rule: ... **[(as per applicant's own admission (page 2-4)]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in

the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ an optimization function for specifying the expectation and gains accumulated over time.

Regarding Claim 26. *Werbos* teaches, basing the approximate dynamic programming on TD(8)-learning. **[(col. 110, line 39-45 "*In any event, the procedure implied ... is considerably more general than any of the original formulation.*")]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ approximate dynamic programming on TD(8)-learning, because, the temporal difference method is a type of reinforcement learning that learn through exploiting the difference in evaluating actions in successive steps and thus handling sequences in an incremental manner.

Regarding Claim 27. *Neuneier* teaches, forming an optimization function within Q-learning in accordance with the following rule: ... **[(as per applicant's own admission (page 8-10)]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ an optimization function for specifying the expectation and gains accumulated over time.

Regarding Claim 28. *Neuneier* teaches, using a technical system to determine the sequence of actions before the determination measured values are measured. **[(as per applicant's own admission (page 1)]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to predict a planning mechanism to determine the sequence of actions to reach the chosen goal state.

Regarding Claim 29. *Werbos* teaches, subjecting the technical system to open-loop control in accordance with the sequence of actions. **[(col. 100, line 20-28 "***In summary, the concept of learning--while not all-encompassing--could be expected to give us a parsimonious understanding ... such research is often useful only when it is integrated into a specific plan to use the sensors within a larger control loop.***")]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ open-loop control, because an open-loop control system is controlled directly, and only, by an input signal, without the benefit of feedback. The basic units of this system are an amplifier and a motor. The amplifier receives a low-level input signal and amplifies it enough to drive the motor to perform the desired job. Open-loop control systems are not as commonly used as closed-loop control systems because they are less accurate.

Regarding Claim 30. *Werbos* teaches, subjecting the technical system to closed-loop control in accordance with the sequence of actions. **[(col. 130, line 19-27 "***Balakrishnan has mainly studied problems in aircraft and missile control ... done tests demonstrating robustness and closed-loop "re-adaptation.***")]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ closed-loop control, because process improvement can be obtained by means of closed-loop control i.e., with reliable. While, the basic idea of feed-back control is to correct disturbances, which may appear

in real production processes. With reliable closed-loop control the process can often be run at paths in the state space which promise a better process performance.

Regarding Claim 31. *Neuneier* teaches, modeling the system as a Markov decision problem. **[(as per applicant's own admission (page 1)]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ a natural approach to developing control architectures for complex tasks is to design multiple simple components, each addressing one aspect of the task domain, and provide a framework for combining the results. When an agent must learn these components by interacting with the environment, as in a Markov decision problem, the designer must take care not to sacrifice an optimal solution for a convenient representation.

8. Claims 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ralph Neuneier*, "Enhanced Q-Learning for Optimal Asset Allocation" Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (1997), further in view of *Howard* (USPN 6,336,109).

Regarding Claim 33. *Howard* teaches, using the system as a communications system. **[(col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 5 "*Another possibility is to use a neural network classifier ...specifically for telecommunications applications.*")]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ a processor is used in a communications system, because the processor (*computer*

system) can be used to analyze data about the transmission of messages in a communications system.

Regarding Claim 34. *Howard* teaches, using the system to carry out access control in a communications network. **[(col. 1, line 11-16 "***In the telecommunications field, large amounts of data are available, for example about customer behavior and telephone usage. This data contains potentially useful information for many purposes such as detection of fraud, marketing, billing, maintenance planning and fault detection.***")]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ a processor is used to carry out access control in a communications network, because the processor (*computer system*) can be used to interpret, analyze and investigate user patterns of behavior in detecting e.g., telecommunications fraud.

Regarding Claim 35. *Howard* teaches, using the system to carry out a routing in a communications network. **[(col. 1, line 11-16 "***In the telecommunications field, large amounts of data are available, for example about customer behavior and telephone usage. This data contains potentially useful information for many purposes such as detection of fraud, marketing, billing, maintenance planning and fault detection.***")]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ a processor is used to carry out routing in a communications network, because the processor (*computer system*) can be used to interpret, analyze and investigate user

patterns of behavior in detecting e.g., in relation to faults in a communications network and encryption key management.

9. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walter J. Gutjahr, "Failure Risk Estimation via Markov Software Usage Models" Department of Statistics, Operations research and Computer Science, University of Vienna, Austria (1997).

Regarding Claim 36. *Gutjahr* teaches, A system for determining a sequence of actions for a system having states, wherein a transition in state between two states is performed on the basis of an action, the system comprising: a processor for determining a sequence of actions, whereby a sequence of states resulting from the sequence of actions is optimized with regard to a prescribed optimization function, and the optimization function includes a variable parameter for setting a risk which the resulting sequence of states has with respect to a prescribed state of the system. **[(Abstract "*... risk estimate ...*) and (5. Experimental results, page 189-190, Table 1)]**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walter J. Gutjahr*, "Failure Risk Estimation via Markov Software Usage Models" Department of Statistics, Operations research and Computer Science, University of Vienna, Austria (1997), further in view of *Werbos* (USPN 6,169,981).

The *Gutjahr* reference has been discussed above and does not explicitly teach the limitation of claim 37-38. However, *Werbos* teaches the limitations of claims 37-38.

Regarding Claim 37. *Werbos* teaches, the processor is used to subject a technical system to open-loop control. **[(col. 100, line 20-28** "*In summary, the concept of learning--while not all-encompassing--could be expected to give us a parsimonious understanding ... such research is often useful only when it is integrated into a specific plan to use the sensors within a larger control loop.*"**)]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ open-loop control, because an open-loop control system is controlled directly, and only, by an input signal, without the benefit of feedback. The basic units of this system are an amplifier and a motor. The amplifier receives a low-level input signal and amplifies it enough to drive the motor to perform the desired job. Open-loop control systems are not as commonly used as closed-loop control systems because they are less accurate.

Regarding Claim 38. *Werbos* teaches, the processor is used to subject a technical system to closed-loop control. **[(col. 130, line 19-27 "*Balakrishnan has mainly studied problems in aircraft and missile control ... done tests demonstrating robustness and closed-loop "re-adaptation.*")]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ closed-loop control, because process improvement can be obtained by means of closed-loop control i.e., with reliable. While, the basic idea of feed-back control is to correct disturbances, which may appear in real production processes. With reliable closed-loop control the process can often be run at paths in the state space which promise a better process performance.

12. Claims 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walter J. Gutjahr*, "Failure Risk Estimation via Markov Software Usage Models" Department of Statistics, Operations research and Computer Science, University of Vienna, Austria (1997), further view of *Howard* (USPN 6,336,109).

Regarding Claim 40. *Howard* teaches, the processor is used in a communications system. **[(col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 5 "*Another possibility is to use a neural network classifier ...specifically for telecommunications applications.*")]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ a processor is used in a communications system, because the processor (*computer*

system) can be used to analyze data about the transmission of messages in a communications system.

Regarding Claim 41. *Howard* teaches, the processor is used to carry out access control in a communications network. **[(col. 1, line 11-16 "***In the telecommunications field, large amounts of data are available, for example about customer behavior and telephone usage. This data contains potentially useful information for many purposes such as detection of fraud, marketing, billing, maintenance planning and fault detection.***")]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ a processor is used to carry out access control in a communications network, because the processor (*computer system*) can be used to interpret, analyze and investigate user patterns of behavior in detecting e.g., telecommunications fraud.

Regarding Claim 42. *Howard* teaches, the processor is used to carry out routing in a communications network. **[(col. 1, line 11-16 "***In the telecommunications field, large amounts of data are available, for example about customer behavior and telephone usage. This data contains potentially useful information for many purposes such as detection of fraud, marketing, billing, maintenance planning and fault detection.***")]** It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ a processor is used to carry out routing in a communications network, because the processor (*computer system*) can be used to interpret, analyze and investigate user

patterns of behavior in detecting e.g., in relation to faults in a communications network and encryption key management.

Response to Remarks

13. Examiner interprets the indication of risk set forth by Neuneier (page 941) sufficient to indicate that it is known. Moreover, examiner interprets Gutjahr use of statistical analysis sufficiently employing the set of possible values for a random variable together with a probability measure defining the likelihood of those values.

Examiners Summary

14. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

15. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence Information

16. Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael B. Holmes, who may be reached Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EST. or via telephone at (571) 272-3686 or facsimile transmission (571) 273-3686 or email Michael.holmesb@uspto.gov.

If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to (703) 746-7239.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful the Examiner's Supervisor, Anthony Knight, may be reached at (571) 272-3687.

Hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist @ (Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22313), located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building.

Michael B. Holmes
Patent Examiner
Artificial Intelligence
Art Unit 2121
United States Department of Commerce
Patent & Trademark Office

Monday, June 27, 2005

MBH

Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600